



RFP #090175 Questions and Responses for the O'Dell Creek Wetlands Monitoring

Deadline for Written questions: 12 PM March 23, 2009
Question and Answer Period for this RFP Is Closed

Section 3, Page 11

1. Please provide a copy of the Site/Monitoring Plan for Phase IV of the O'Dell Creek Headwaters (OCH) In Lieu Fee (ILF), or provide instructions how we can obtain this monitoring plan.

Answer: Site/Monitoring Plan pdf file available from FWP Purchasing Agent- Attached

Section 3, Page 11, Scope Item #1

2. Aerial photography indicates there are existing wetlands associated with O'Dell Creek that are not part of mitigation. Please provide a map or coordinates clearly defining the limits of the project area and proposed wetland mitigation site(s).

Answer: Boundaries aerial pdf file showing map and coordinates available from FWP Purchasing Agent- Attached

3. A wetland delineation should have been completed to obtain permits for this project and to determine that the proposed mitigation site was formerly upland prior to developing a mitigation plan. Please provide copies of the delineation, mitigation report, and maps submitted to the Corps of Engineers.

Answer: Wetland delineation and supporting documentation is on file with Corps of Engineers Helena Regulatory Office (COE). FWP did not conduct this delineation so does not maintain copies of the requested documentation.

Section 3, Page 11, Scope Item #2

4. How many sod borrow sites exist and what is their average size?

Answer: River Design Group, Inc. (RDG) of Whitefish was the firm responsible for construction of the Phase IV mitigation project. RDG can provide information on the number/size of sod borrow sites. A majority of wetland sods employed for the project were generated from one primary borrow area.

5. Will FWP provide a map or coordinates locating all sod mat borrow sources for monitoring purposes?

Answer: No

6. Will a photo point and vegetation data be required for every sod borrow site?

Answer: FWP considers this degree of data collection necessary when specified in the Site/Monitoring Plan. Further questions in this regard may be directed to the COE.

Section 3, Page 11, Scope Item #3

7. What are the physical boundaries of the wetland, open water, and vegetative community map layers?

Answer: The physical boundaries of the project site are shown in the Boundary Aerial Pdf file referenced above as available from FWP Purchasing Agent. Attached

8. Was vegetation community mapping already conducted for this project and, if so, will these data be provided by FWP?

Answer: FWP has not conducted vegetation community mapping of the site.

9. Is there a required level of accuracy for this mapping (i.e. 10 meter, 1 meter, 1 foot)

Answer: FWP considers the required level of accuracy for mapping of this project to be commensurate with previous mitigation reports filed with the COE by it and other state agencies including the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT). FWP defers response to this question to the COE who can reference the level of accuracy required of MDT in its mitigation monitoring/reports.

Section 3, Page 11, Scope Item #4

10. Have noxious weed infestations been mapped within the project area?

Answer: No

11. If so, will FWP provide weed maps or shape files of weed infestations?

Answer: No

Section 3, Page 11, Scope Item #5

12. Will FWP provide shape files of existing, pre-mitigation wetlands and uplands within the project area?

Answer: No

Section 3, Page 11, Scope Item #6

13. What types and how many stream gages are installed?

Answer: FWP does not have stream gauges installed on the site. However, a series of staff gauges have been installed and periodically monitored in the project area by River Design Group, Inc. Discontinuous flow records are available from RDG.

14. Is there a need for any additional stream gauges to be installed?

Answer: FWP does not believe that there is a need to install additional stream gauges on the site. However, the respondent may wish to contact the COE to confirm.

15. What is required for stream gauge maintenance?

Answer: Stream gauge maintenance in the context of this RFP is intended to include working with the owners of the ranch owners and the owners of the existing gauges (RDG) to ensure that existing gauges can be read at appropriate intervals to ensure that the requirements of the Site/Monitoring Plan are being met.

16. Have rating curves been developed?

Answer: FWP does not have rating curves from these the above-referenced gauges.

17. Will rating curves and existing hydrologic data be provided by FWP?

Answer: No. FWP does not have these data but as referenced above, respondents may contact RDG to request access to available information.

18. If rating curves are provided, do they need to be verified?

Answer: FWP is not aware of the existence of rating curves nor whether any in existence require verification. Again, although FWP does not have this information, respondents may contact RDG to request information in this regard.

19. What information and format is included in the existing hydrologic data set?

Answer: FWP does not maintain files of existing information and format of the hydrologic data set. Again, although FWP does not have this information, respondents may contact RDG to request information in this regard.

20. Will FWP provide the consultant with coordinates and elevation data for the as-built profile?

Answer: An as-built survey was not completed for the Phase IV project. Coordinates, benchmarks, and elevation data are available from RDG.

21. In what format will these data be provided?

Answer: Respondents may contact RDG to request information in this regard.

22. Are the interim report (three fourths of the way through the project) and the final report included in the annual reports requested in Paragraph 16?

Answer: FWP must meet the COE reporting requirements as stipulated in the Site/Monitoring Plan. Respondents are directed to the Plan for specifics in regard to reporting. Further clarification if necessary may be requested from the COE.

23. Is the report of findings the same as the annual reports mentioned in Paragraph 16?

Answer: FWP must meet the COE reporting requirements as stipulated in the Site/Monitoring Plan. Respondents are directed to the Plan for specifics in regard to reporting. Further clarification if necessary may be requested from the COE.

24. Will FWP provide the “contact information and reports necessary to provide context for prior work done to design and build the 2008 ILF mitigation project”?

Answer: River Design Group, Inc. may be contacted to provide point file data from the plan and profile sheets for the Phase IV project.

Section 3, Page 11-12

25. Are the annual reports described herein the same as the reports described in Paragraphs 13 and 14?

Answer: It is unclear from this question what Paragraphs 13 and 14 are referred to in this question. There is one report required for each year that monitoring is conducted.

26. If the reports are different, can FWP provide a detailed explanation of what is required in each type of report?

Answer: As stated in response to question 25. above, it is unclear which Paragraphs 13 and 14 are referred to. Mitigation report examples, such as those filed by MDT for its mitigation sites, are on file with the COE and are also online at:
<http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/environmental/external/wetlands/>

Section 3, Page 12

27. How many reports will be required for this contract?

Answer: As stated on the bottom of page 11 of the RFP, reports for each year of monitoring are to be prepared and filed with the COE. The actual number of reports required will be determined by the number of years of monitoring that will be required by the COE during this contract period which is dependent upon development of the requisite wetland mitigation acres.